



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

however, some slight modification. So, for example, he savs (1):

Vergil's interest was doubtless, in a large degree, apologetic. He sought to win over to the cause of Augustus any of the old republican spirits, who might be grieving at the passing of the elder time of political liberty.

This statement gives the impression that Vergil was indulging in antirepublican propaganda. As a matter of fact, Vergil seems consciously to avoid the monarchical note in the Aeneid, although he does devote much laudation to the Julian Line. This is the more striking because Vergil was the first of Roman writers to glorify the young Octavian with divine attributes¹.

Again, in his commentary, Servius followed the tendency of the period in laying great stress on etymology. Dr. Taylor would have done well to point out that many of these etymologies are not to be relied on. The scholars of the fourth century are inordinately fond of etymologizing, but their zeal often betrays them, and Servius was no exception to this rule². Many of the etymologies in the Servian commentary which can confidently be rejected have none the less done much to give a false impression of the history of a nation's religious belief. As Sayce says, "False etymologies are of themselves the fruitful causes of myths".

More care in printing, and the avoidance of certain ineptitudes of style would have done much to improve what is intrinsically a rather scholarly piece of work.

UNION COLLEGE HARRISON CADWALLADER COFFIN

NOTES ON ELEUSIS

Under the expert and generous guidance of Dr. Orlandos, the American School of Classical Studies at Athens had the opportunity in April of studying recent developments at Eleusis. Dr. Orlandos paid special attention to his restoration of the triumphal arches at the sides of the Great Propylaea, which are close copies of the Arch of Hadrian at Athens; to the construction of the portico of the Telesterion, which apparently had a gable; and to the tympanum of the Great Propylaea, of which the central block is tongued into the side blocks as in the Propylaea on the Acropolis (see W. B. Dinsmoor, *American Journal of Archaeology*, 14 [1910], 149). With regard to the Temple of Artemis the corrections Dr. Orlandos makes in the drawings by Gandy (*Antiquities of Attica*, Chapter V, Plates 1-8) are considerable. In consequence, Figure 352, on page 309, of Marquand, *Greek Architecture*, and the statement directly below it must be described as incorrect.

It is established beyond doubt that the temple was not a double temple *in antis*, a type of which we have no examples and which probably never existed. The evidence for this is an epistyle block, which on account of the oblique cuttings of its inner corners, the an-

tithema of the inner surface, and the planed under surface with abacus marking, could only have served in the south side of the rear porch of a prostyle building.

Among other corrections of note are the following: (1) The walls are not of uniform thickness at top and bottom, but have a slight diminution (.58 cm. at top instead of .60 cm.). The epistyle block (.78 cm.) consequently projects widely (Gandy's epistyle block does not belong in this building). The rather awkward effect is relieved by Lesbian leaf and dart mouldings on both outer and inner surfaces; (2) The front porch is not of the same depth as the rear, but is approximately twice as deep; (3) the inclination of the tympanum is 1: 3.28, more pronounced than that given by Gandy (1:3.67).

Regarding the date, Dr. Orlandos, from the type of foundation, the number of steps (five), the size of the front porch, and the slope of the tympanum, argues that the work is undoubtedly Roman. It appears likely, however, that it slightly antedates the Great Propylaea, which is of the Antonine period; not only is the technique of the stone-working earlier, but also the lack of orientation with reference to the Propylaea and the fact that Pausanias mentions the temple (1.38.6) confirm the earlier date.

AMERICAN SCHOOL, ATHENS, GREECE

W. R. AGARD

MARTIAL AND MORLEY ON SMELLS

In Christopher Morley's *Chimneysmoke*, a delightful book of his collected verse, there is a short lyric entitled "Smells", in which the author asks:

Why is it that the poets tell
So little of the sense of smell?

One might do worse than refer Mr. Morley to the poet Martial, not so much to answer his query as to present to him an exception to the implication contained therein. For it would appear from his own words that the great Roman epigrammatist had an extremely sensitive nose, in spite of existing sanitary conditions that must have demanded a certain deadening of the olfactory sense to insure peace of mind. He makes mention, complainingly, several times of the unwelcome odor of purple-dyed garments—*olidae vestes murice* (e. g. 1.49.32; 4.4.6.; 9.62). On the other hand, of the heavy scent of Roman perfumes he was continually aware, as he testifies frequently in verse (e. g. 3.55; 6.55.3; 7.41; 9.26.2; 10.38.8; 11.8.9; 12.55.7; 14.59.2; etc.) that must have served the perfumery firms of Cosmus and Niceros with abundant advertising copy. (In Morley's "Smells (Junior)", Mother is redolent "of lavender and listerine"; in Martial 3.55 Gellia smells pungently of Cosmus's wares).

For Martial, odors fall into two categories: unpleasant and pleasant. He has catalogued both kinds for us in three particular poems. In 4.4 he describes with no mincing words why the company of Bassa was distinctly distasteful to his aesthetic sense on its olfactory side; and he is just as frank with

¹Compare Tenney Frank, *Vergil, A Biography*, 174 ff.

²Compare W. P. Mustard, *The Etymologies in the Servian Commentary to Vergil* (Johns Hopkins University Dissertation, 1892).